

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-45 are presently active. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 15-19, 23, 24, 27, 30-40, and 42 have been presently amended. Claims 5, 12-14, 21-22, and 28-29 were canceled without prejudice.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 15 and 16 were objected to due to informalities. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 15-21, and 23-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cunningham et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,321,337) in view of Reshef et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,321,337). Claims 8, 12-14, and 22 were objected to for being dependent from a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.<sup>1</sup>

Firstly, Claims 15 and 16 have been amended as suggested in the final Office Action. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to Claims 15 and 16 have been overcome.

Secondly, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 8, 12-14, and 22. In order to expedite prosecution of the present case, the subject matter in Claims 12-14 has been included in the present independent claims with further clarification of the invention regarding the basis for determining a preferred response to forward to the proxy server for transmission to the service-requesting client.<sup>2</sup>

Thirdly, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Parthasarathy to interview this case on November 9, 2005 during which time the outstanding issues in the Office Action were discussed as substantially summarized herebelow.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For the record, Ronald Rudder and Daniel Stephenson take exception to the characterization made in the outstanding Office Action that they agreed that the invention was not properly claimed as filed on June 11, 2001.

<sup>2</sup> Support for the clarification as to the basis for determining a preferred response is found in Applicants' specification, page 8, lines 14-22.

<sup>3</sup> Ronald Rudder and Daniel Stevenson were Applicants representatives during the interview.

During the interview, Applicants' representatives discussed the present invention in view of Applicants' Figure 1 and the description thereof in the specification. Applicants' representatives discussed with the examiner her understanding of the allowable subject matter identified in the last Office Action and how the claims could be amended to include the allowable subject matter. While no agreement on final language was reached during the interview, the present amendment incorporates the allowable subject matter of Claims 12-14 with clarification into the independent claims, and cancels appropriate claims.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 2, 18, and 19 and the claims dependent therefrom patentably define over the applied prior art.

Finally, this amendment is submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.116 which after final rejection permits entering of amendments canceling claims, complying with any requirement of form expressly set forth in a previous Office Action, presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal, or presenting amendments touching on the merits upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the amendment is necessary and was not presented earlier. The present amendment incorporates with clarification the allowable subject matter identified in the outstanding Office Action in dependent Claims 12-14 into the independent claims, thereby placing these claims in a condition for allowance. No new matter has been added, and this amendment does not raise new issues requiring further consideration and/or search. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present amendment be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

Application No. 09/878,824  
Reply to Office Action of October 4, 2005

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number  
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)  
GJM:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\271'S\271905US\AM-FNL.DOC

  
Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870  
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 45,618